

## Accreditation Case Study

---

### Northern Mars University seeks CIDA accreditation

#### September 2008

- Program coordinator contacts the CIDA office to inquire about seeking CIDA accreditation.
- CIDA staff advise the program regarding the accreditation process and the importance of program self-study in preparation for an accreditation review. The program is referred to CIDA's website ([www.accredit-id.org](http://www.accredit-id.org)) to download Professional Standards 2009. The program is also encouraged to download the *Accreditation Manual* prior to seeking CIDA accreditation.
- Program coordinator downloads CIDA's Standards from the website for review.

#### October 2008

- Program coordinator provides CIDA's Standards to faculty members at a monthly meeting and requests that faculty members review the Standards and prepare to discuss them at the faculty's next meeting.

#### November 2008

- Faculty members discuss CIDA's criteria and take assignments to report on how the courses they teach address criteria. Faculty members agree to continue discussion at their next meeting in January.

#### January 2009

- Faculty members report on how their own courses address criteria. Faculty agree that more analysis of how the program meets criteria is needed in order to proceed and that the program coordinator should attend CIDA's Accreditation Workshop to receive further direction.
- Program coordinator registers for CIDA's Accreditation Workshop and downloads the *Accreditation Manual*.

#### March 2009

- Program coordinator attends the Accreditation Workshop. Program coordinator gets some great ideas about how to proceed with program self-study in preparation for a CIDA accreditation review. Program coordinator also receives a wealth of information about the accreditation process, hosting a site visit, demonstrating compliance with CIDA Standards, and organizing the student work display.

#### March – September 2009

- Program plans and begins implementation of a self-study process in preparation for an accreditation review. Continued faculty discussion of curriculum content in relation to CIDA criteria suggests some minor adjustments to course content are appropriate. The program begins the process of adjusting course content to address gaps identified in the curriculum.

This document outlines a scenario of a program seeking accreditation. The program and judgments of quality are fiction for purpose of illustration only.

## Accreditation Case Study

---

### **October 2009**

- Program targets spring 2011 for an on-site review based on their self-study timeline.
- Program submits an application for accreditation and the Request for Site Visit Dates form with optional dates listed for spring 2011.
- Program continues self-study process.

### **November 2009**

- CIDA sends a letter to the program accepting the application for accreditation and requests information about influential program characteristics to guide the CIDA office in composing a visiting team to review the program. The program is also alerted that their self-study report (Program Analysis Report) is due in the CIDA office eight weeks prior to the site visit and that visiting teams for spring 2011 will be formed in spring 2011.
- Program continues self-study process.

### **December 2009**

- CIDA office begins contacting potential visiting team members for spring 2011 site visits.

### **April 2010**

- Program receives letter with the proposed visiting team members along with the proposed site visit dates.
- Program sends CIDA a letter confirming the team member composition and indicating that March 12-15 is the preferred time for the site visit.
- Program continues self-study process.

### **May 2010**

- CIDA office notifies visiting team members of program acceptance and confirms the March 12-15 visit dates.
- CIDA office sends a letter to the program confirming the visit dates with notification that the due date for the Program Analysis Report is January 15, 2011. Electronic templates for completing the Program Analysis Report are included on a CD with this letter.
- Program continues self-study process.

### **May-September 2010**

- Program continues self-study process.

This document outlines a scenario of a program seeking accreditation. The program and judgments of quality are fiction for purpose of illustration only.

## Accreditation Case Study

---

### September 2010

- CIDA office sends a reminder to the program regarding the upcoming site visit in spring 2011 and the due date for the Program Analysis Report. This letter includes alerts about minor changes to the Program Analysis Report format along with updated electronic templates for completing the report.
- Program faculty members finalize analysis of self-study findings and agree that the program coordinator should draft the primary narrative of the report. Other faculty members take assignments to compile the personnel data forms and institutional and program data required for the report.

### October 2010

- Program coordinator writes the first draft of the Program Analysis Report.

### November 2010

- Faculty members and program administration review the first draft of the Program Analysis Report and meet to provide feedback for further development.
- Program coordinator edits the report based on feedback.
- Program receives an invoice from CIDA for the March 2011 site visit administrative and travel fees. Payment is due to the CIDA office no later than March 11, 2011.

### December 2010

- Program coordinator provides the Program Analysis Report to faculty members and program administration for final review.
- Program coordinator makes adjustments to finalize the report.
- CIDA office sends information about the visiting team's travel itinerary to the program.

### January 2011

- Program sends one copy of the Program Analysis Report with a college catalog to the CIDA office. Electronic versions of these documents are also mailed on CD to the office.
- Program sends one copy of the Program Analysis Report with a college catalog to each of the visiting team members, along with a CD containing all of the documents.
- Program sends the CIDA office and the visiting team chair the draft site visit schedule along with lodging and ground transportation information for the visiting team members.

### February 2011

- Visiting team chair provides some suggestions for grouping faculty for on-site interviews and sends these to the program coordinator (and copies the CIDA office).
- Program adjusts the visit schedule accordingly and submits a finalized schedule to the team (and copies the CIDA office).

This document outlines a scenario of a program seeking accreditation. The program and judgments of quality are fiction for purpose of illustration only.

## Accreditation Case Study

---

### March 2011

- The site visit takes place. Key events include:
  - Review of student work.
  - Fact-finding meetings with students, faculty, administration.
  - Visiting team work sessions.
  - Exit interviews with faculty and administration to review team's findings.
- CIDA office sends a reminder notice to the visiting team that their report (Visiting Team Report) is due in the CIDA office by March 22, 2011.
- CIDA office sends a letter to the program outlining the review process following a site visit, including the dates of the next Accreditation Commission meeting at which a decision on accreditation will be made.
- Draft Visiting Team Report is received in the CIDA office.
- CIDA staff edits the report for spelling, grammar, and format. The staff drafts a memo to the visiting team outlining some questions about report content. The Program Analysis Report, Visiting Team Report, and draft memo to the team are sent to two primary readers from the Accreditation Commission who send their questions about report content to the CIDA office.
- CIDA staff adds Commissioner questions to the visiting team memo.

### April 2011

- Visiting Team Report, along with the memo from staff and Commissioners, is sent to the visiting team for review.
- Visiting team responds to concerns raised in memo by providing some additional information and agreeing to some suggested changes in language.
- Visiting Team Report is mailed to program with the team's recommended accreditation status.

### May 2011

- Program responds with a few technical corrections and a letter outlining content concerns. The program also notes that some areas identified as gaps are already being addressed through curriculum changes approved for implementation in fall 2011.
- Content concerns are mailed to the visiting team for review.
- Visiting team chair reviews the program response, consults with fellow team members, and determines that no changes will be made to the content of the report.
- Visiting Team Report, with the program response, is circulated to Evaluation Committee readers (visiting team chairs) who are asked to review the report and provide feedback on whether or not the content of the report supports the team's determination of compliance, partial compliance, or non-compliance with Standards and whether or not the content of the report supports the team's recommendation for accreditation.

This document outlines a scenario of a program seeking accreditation. The program and judgments of quality are fiction for purpose of illustration only.

## Accreditation Case Study

---

### June 2011

- Evaluation Committee reader responses are compiled. Some readers disagree with the recommended accreditation status.
- Final documents are mailed to the Accreditation Commission: Visiting Team Report, editing memo, program response to the VTR, team response to the program's response, Evaluation Committee comments – Commissioners also have the Program Analysis Report.

### July 2011

- Accreditation Commissioners meet July 22-23 and make decisions on programs visited in spring 2011.
  - Following a discussion of all programs, the Commissioners vote to award accreditation for six years to the interior design program at Northern Mars University.
- Program is notified of the Accreditation Commission's decision by overnight mail.

### August 2011

- Final Accreditation Report is issued to the program.

### October 2014

- Progress Report is due.

### Fall 2017

- Program's next visit.

This document outlines a scenario of a program seeking accreditation. The program and judgments of quality are fiction for purpose of illustration only.